

## The name on the cover

Monica Chagas da Costa

Submetido em 11 de setembro de 2016.

Aceito para publicação em 13 de julho de 2017.

*Cadernos do IL*, Porto Alegre, n.º 55, dezembro de 2017. p. 202-212

---

### POLÍTICA DE DIREITO AUTORAL

Autores que publicam nesta revista concordam com os seguintes termos:

- (a) Os autores mantêm os direitos autorais e concedem à revista o direito de primeira publicação, com o trabalho simultaneamente licenciado sob a Creative Commons Attribution License, permitindo o compartilhamento do trabalho com reconhecimento da autoria do trabalho e publicação inicial nesta revista.
  - (b) Os autores têm autorização para assumir contratos adicionais separadamente, para distribuição não exclusiva da versão do trabalho publicada nesta revista (ex.: publicar em repositório institucional ou como capítulo de livro), com reconhecimento de autoria e publicação inicial nesta revista.
  - (c) Os autores têm permissão e são estimulados a publicar e distribuir seu trabalho online (ex.: em repositórios institucionais ou na sua página pessoal) a qualquer ponto antes ou durante o processo editorial, já que isso pode gerar alterações produtivas, bem como aumentar o impacto e a citação do trabalho publicado.
  - (d) Os autores estão conscientes de que a revista não se responsabiliza pela solicitação ou pelo pagamento de direitos autorais referentes às imagens incorporadas ao artigo. A obtenção de autorização para a publicação de imagens, de autoria do próprio autor do artigo ou de terceiros, é de responsabilidade do autor. Por esta razão, para todos os artigos que contenham imagens, o autor deve ter uma autorização do uso da imagem, sem qualquer ônus financeiro para os Cadernos do IL.
- 

### POLÍTICA DE ACESSO LIVRE

Esta revista oferece acesso livre imediato ao seu conteúdo, seguindo o princípio de que disponibilizar gratuitamente o conhecimento científico ao público proporciona sua democratização.

<http://seer.ufrgs.br/cadernosdoil/index>  
Sexta-feira, 29 de dezembro de 2017  
17:59:59

## THE NAME ON THE COVER

### O NOME NA CAPA

Monica Chagas da Costa<sup>1</sup>

**RESUMO:** *O presente trabalho tem como objetivo analisar o conceito de autoria apresentado nas teorias sobre o tema postuladas por Michel Foucault em “O que é um autor?”, por Roland Barthes em “A Morte do Autor”, por Mikhail Bakhtin em “Questões de Literatura e Estética”, e por Wayne Booth em “A Retórica da Ficção”. A partir do trabalho dos quatro pensadores, é possível delinear âmbitos nos quais essa figura se define e a partir dos quais é acionada. É proposta, então, uma visão do autor literário que se ancora em quatro características: o nome do autor, o seu corpo textual, o seu corpo documental e o seu corpo axiológico.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Autor; Função-autor; Autor Implícito.*

**ABSTRACT:** *The objective of the present work is to analyze the concept of authorship presented by theoreticians Michel Foucault in the text “What is an author?”, Roland Barthes in “The Death of the Author”, Mikhail Bakhtin in “Questões de Literatura e Estética,” and Wayne Booth in “The Rhetoric of Fiction.” Based on the work of these four thinkers, it is possible to delineate fields in which this image is defined and from which it is put into action. We then propose a view of the literary author, which is primarily grounded in four characteristics: the name of the author, its textual body, its documental body, and its axiological body.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Author; Author-function; Implicit Author.*

The image of the author is a mystic image. Authors have been seen as abstract entities, so far distanced from us that we can only have contact with them through the pages of a book. We cannot see their bodies, we cannot listen to their voices, and we cannot smell their scent. The only thing we have access to is their words and, if the editor is a little generous, a short biography by the end of the book.

The author is also a very powerful being. It is usually to his or her hands that we surrender large numbers of hours of our lives, and it is him or her in whom we trust through paths so far unseen and undiscovered that we might have been too scared to trail were we by ourselves. They are powerful, also, because they make themselves very close to their readers, us – and yet, at the same time, very scarce.

Therefore, this mysterious, powerful, and very intriguing figure draws a lot of attention from all kinds of readers. And one thing shines through all the fuss: the figure has a name. Usually, if they are famous enough, it is written in big prints on the cover of the book, according to current practices of editing houses. This name, be it William

---

<sup>1</sup> Mestre em Estudos de Literatura pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, monicachagasdacosta@gmail.com

Shakespeare, Salman Rushdie, George Eliot, or be it Stephanie Meyer, Augusto Cury or Paulo Coelho, grand or little, despised or acclaimed, is used for several things.

The name of an author is anaphoric. It serves, of course, to design a certain person in the world who spent some time writing books, which contain their stories, poems or ideas. In this first, basic sense, the name of the author is almost like any other name, selecting and labeling an individual in the world. However, whenever we see a name on the cover of a book, there is a different kind of anaphoric system put to work.

Every time we say “I’ve got my Shakespeare here with me”, or “I know my Eliot from head to toe”, or even “I’ve read through all of Jane Austen”, we are not referring to the individuals that actually wrote the books. We actually mean that we are familiar with a certain body of texts that has the common characteristic of having the same label as the covers of their books. This label can also serve to a certain group of ideas or specific knowledge that we can refer to by the author’s name. This happens when we say “I understand Foucault” or “I disagree with Spencer”. We are talking about a set of ideas that are a part of an author’s work and that can be referred to by his or her name. Finally, there is also the possibility of using the names of authors to refer to specific cultural or personal qualities traditionally related to their style of living and to the body of their works. If somebody tells you “That is very Oscar Wilde of you”, that is related to both the person who lived and was known as Oscar Wilde, and to the body of fictional, imaginative, and critical work that he produced during his life. The same happens when the sentence “This is very Jane Austen-like” is used. It can refer to a broad scope of things, from behaviors and objects related to the Regency period to the great amount of film adaptations that has been produced since the beginning of cinema, and which have consolidated shared ideas around the name Jane Austen. Besides that, these remarks are undeniably related to the works which she produced and were later on published under her name.

Therefore, the name of the author can serve many purposes, and such name has not served these many purposes throughout History in the same manner. The way people have understood specific names of specific authors has changed according to currents of thought and ideologies that were dominant in each period. In a general manner, the author’s name, as a very important and defining quality of written works, has been a mark of literary and scientific production from the Modern Age onwards. According to Roland Barthes,

The author is a modern figure, a product of our society insofar as, emerging from the Middle Ages with English empiricism, French rationalism and the personal faith of the Reformation, it discovered the prestige of the individual, of, as it is more nobly put, the “human person”. (BARTHES, 1977, 142-3)

In the literary context, specifically, Barthes statements ring particularly true. From the anonymity of poets whose work circulated from mouth to mouth in Ancient and Medieval cultures, the author has grown more and more as an essential item of a literary work. On the age of exacerbation of the “I”, when everybody puts his or her own stamp on everything, it is almost impossible to factually imagine a work that is unmarred by any kind of authorship. It is easy to think of multiple or shared kinds of authorship, but the sense of

creation and the idea that something must necessarily be owned by somebody is very deep rooted in our capitalist age.

In literary theory, the author has been a motive for discussion for many years. By the end of the Nineteenth Century and the beginning of the Twentieth, the focus of literary criticism was comparing the life of the subject who wrote the work with his or her fiction or poetry, in order to discover intended meanings through biographic data. The main kind of interpretation during this period aimed at finding out what the author really meant, and was guided by the author's trajectory.

With the beginning of Formalism, in the first decades of the Twentieth century, and the forthcoming wave of Structuralism that took over literary theory, the focus shifted to the text, diminishing the importance of authors and their intentions. Finally, in the Sixties, the discussion got to such a point that the author died.

Hence, whenever we, Twenty-first Century thinkers, talk about authorship, the most celebrated names must be the ones responsible for the author's assassination. The first, most scandalous name, is that of Roland Barthes, a French theorist who began his career as a structuralist and semiotician and who then moved over to post-structuralism, by declaring the author's death.

In his essay, "The death of the Author", published first in 1967<sup>2</sup>, Roland Barthes presents the *écriture* as "the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin" (BARTHES, 1977, 142). Therefore, by writing, the subject runs away and loses its identity through the escape of its own body. This happens when the narrative is intransitive and does not act upon reality but when it functions as a symbol. The perception of time, from his view of a destructed subjectivity, is modified. Previously, time was organized in the order *before* = *author*, *after* = *work*. With the shifted perspective, both are produced simultaneously, in the here and now of the narrative.

The concept of language also changes, because instead of being a representation or a record of something, it becomes the performance and the origin of the text in itself. Having such premises, the text is always an object for questioning, because language is seen both as origin and as the questioning of the origin, in a permanent analysis of itself.

The linearity of the text is also put under scrutiny, because Barthes states very clearly that the text is non-linear. What is spawned from the *écriture* is a space of multiple dimensions: there are quotations of multiple cultural origins woven together. The only possibility, hence, is imitation, because words are translatable only by themselves (that is, it is only possible to get to the word through words, and originality, then, is impossible, because each translation is a word already said). The power of the writer, however, is "to mix writings, to counter the ones with the other, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them" (BARTHES, 1977, 146).

The imposition of an author to a text closes the writing. In his conclusion, Barthes dislocates the meaning of the text, understood as a process of weaving things together: it is not in the author, the original creator, but in the reader, the final destination. Nonetheless, this destination is not marked historically, but it is ahistorical, since it is postulated by language.

---

<sup>2</sup> According to Bellei (2014, 164): "Em 'A morte do autor', publicado por Barthes em inglês no periódico norte-americano *Aspen*, em 1967 [...]".

The important thing about Barthes' theory is that its focus had shifted from the author and his or her intentional meaning to the *écriture* and its openness of meanings. The idea supported by him is that, with the *écriture*, the text would be open to any meaning the reader chose to ascribe to it. An ideal text in the barthesian perspective is one that did not contain meaning, but that surfed over it through where the waves took each reader.

Ultimately, he closes the door for the author on one end, but opens the window that leads him back when he posits that authority is in the hands of the readers. The reader is now responsible for giving meaning to this mass of intertextual vivacity seen in the literary text. Only the readers can capture this, and, therefore, they are turned into 'the' authors of their own reading.

The other thinker who discusses the end of the idea of the author is Michel Foucault, who was French as well, and who worked, in the Sixties, on this struggle against authorial power. Foucault is not as violent as Barthes, and did not kill the author, but he produced a text called "What is an author?" that is an investigation of what is left whenever this figure exits the stage. What he proposes is that, once the author is removed, we are left with breaches and fissures that worked as the functions which the author occupied when he or she was on scene. These functions are inextricable from the texts.

He summarizes these functions under a single name: the author-function. This is the characteristic function of the quotation's modes of existence and of the workings of certain discourses in society. There are four main characteristics: (a) the author-function ascribes propriety to a text. It is related to the fact that an author is on the spot for legal and penal punishment for his or her texts' contraventions. According to CAVALHEIRO (2008, 68), "Historicamente, os textos passaram a ter autores na medida em que os discursos tornaram-se transgressores com origens passíveis de punição". (b) The author-function is also an act of attribution: not all kinds of texts demand authorship. However, in certain contexts, anonymity, especially in literature, is unbearable and is only acceptable as a puzzle to be solved. (c) There is a somewhat psychologizing projection of the treatment of texts. This process depends on the historical moment and the kind of discourse in which the text is inserted (there is a difference between a poet and a philosopher, for example). (d) There is a certain amount of discursive signs, whose functions are different in speeches that present or not an author-function, which refer to the author within the texts.

Foucault's thesis is very well summarized in the paragraph:

Further elaboration would, of course, disclose other characteristics of the "author-function", but I have limited myself to the four that seemed the most obvious and important. They can be summarized in the following manner: the "author-function" is tied to the legal and institutional systems that circumscribe, determine, and articulate the realm of discourses, at all times, and in any given culture; it is not defined by spontaneous attribution of a text to its creator, but through a series of precise and complex procedures; it does not refer, purely and simply, to an actual individual insofar as it simultaneously gives rise to a variety of egos and to a series of subjective positions that individual of any class may come to occupy. (FOUCAULT, 1977, 130-1)

So, what do these two theorists, Barthes and Foucault, have in common that makes them kill or shunt the author off? One of the main problems for the French in the Sixties is the problem of authority and the abuse of power. The author as an all-encompassing figure that holds every intention of the text is, by logic, a very oppressing figure, especially in light of other, more liberating characters such as what Barthes calls *écriture* or what Foucault calls discursivity, which are much more open to individual use than trying to discover the intention of a subject.

Apart from what they had in common, what were their differences pertaining this disappearing figure? Those basically rely on the kind of approach each one gives to the texts. Foucault is much more worried with the role the discourses of each author play in social fields, and the kind of power relations that are engendered with the actualization of an author. Therefore, his preoccupation is far more external to the text than internal. Even though he does bring to light the possibility of analyzing the discourses from within, and discovering what the exit of the author might show in its discursive use, the text itself is not his main preoccupation. He is rather interested in the place the text holds according to its author and the relation it has with other texts and other forms of social expressions.

Barthes, on the contrary, is much more worried with the opening of the meaning of the text, in the sense that it is not exact anymore, but it is a sea of different and multiple discourses that are weaved in this one work that is not contained by a name, but by its own language, by its own act of writing (and of reading). This incurs in bringing to life a new kind of critical posture in face of new and old texts. What Barthes now wants is not one exact meaning of one particular text, but to be able to imbed himself within meanings that can be uncovered and discovered in every part of every text (and the more multiple they are the better, as well as the more contradictory they are the better). In his later text, "*Le plaisir du text*", this is the new position he states for the contemporary critics to put themselves in, as both critics and readers. His later productions become more and more open-ended, until the point they are in the borders of criticism and fiction, and so, rediscovering this idea of authorship as fictional creation. According to Figueiredo (2014, 191-2), "a volta do autor se afirma através desse gosto declarado pelas escritas de si, [...] Ele deixava para trás as formulas mais duras do estruturalismo em favor de uma valorização da subjetividade".

Barthes and Foucault are not the only names in theory that discuss the question of what defines an author or what the characteristics of authorship are. There are several theorists who try to think more deeply about what talking about an author means, especially in terms of literary production. The two we find supplementary to the already mentioned French thinkers are two very different names, who lived in completely opposite parts of the world.

The first one lived in the post-revolutionary Soviet Union, writing in the beginning of the Twentieth Century, in the lead of Russian Formalists, taking very particular standpoints in the analysis of literature and of language. In a certain sense, a very revolutionary author himself, Mikhail Bakhtin wrote a number of important and seminal books that try to explore the idea of what discourse is, what it is formed of and how it is organized in literary fiction, while representing real life language in use. Thus, Bakhtin is a very materialistic analyst, in the sense that he uses his theory to get to language that is actually in use and not merely an abstraction. His theory of the author is very complex,

nonetheless. His idea, presented mainly in the book *Questões de Literatura e Estética*, is that the author is an axiological direction in the text. He or she is the textual organizational axis that holds the discourses in his or her own hands, in order to put them to a certain use.

This particular idea of the speech as something made of other discourses is interesting and relevant to be further analyzed. His concept of discourse is deeply dependent on its materiality – it is always an enunciation, and only through its enunciating it is possible to discover the marks of historicity that permeate an individual speech. The question goes beyond simple linguistic material, once the discursive subject Bakhtin declares is always in relation to others. His discourse is structured in intersubjectivity: there is no word that has not been somebody else's. The moment a subject enunciates (a literary text or not), he or she puts him or herself in a relationship with a language which is primarily historical.

Historicity, for Bakhtin, is deeply related to the concept of genre (that appears more clearly delineated in his *Estética da Criação Verbal*), but it is configured in a general manner as the marks of social and cultural situations within linguistic elements. To put it more blatantly: a word, and its meaning, can only be understood in its social, historical and cultural context, which is defined by the speaker as well as by the body of similar texts with which it is related. Genre is the stabilization of a mode of use of certain texts in certain contexts.

Speech suffers its actualizations through genres, and it is a part of language that is situated within linguistic and social borders. It is the center of language as an interaction amongst subjects, who are always historically marked. The spoken word is, therefore, permanently marked by the social, historical and cultural tensions, which are part of the society to which the subject is related.

Therefore, having this conception of discourse and putting the author as the director of the speech, he opens an interesting gap which holds possible the introjections of others' discourses into the author's, and puts intertextuality (even though he never uses this term in particular) into the centre of the subject's speech, and hence the author's speech. This is particularly interesting, especially if compared with Barthes' idea that the intertextual sea of references cannot allow for the existence of the unique subject, because it is an alternative way of dealing with intertextuality as a part of everyday speech, and, most importantly, literary speech, especially in the case of the novel.

Bakhtin focus on the novel is in accordance with his aesthetic program, which claims that the kind of aesthetic that the novel provides is actually representing discourse, or discursive productivity, in itself. He categorizes poetry in a much more monological and, therefore, less socially rich form of art. What he calls attention to is that the novel is, by definition, the literary form in which different social strata have the place for speaking on their own, and yet, he does not deny, by this, that there is an author who speaks. He denies, for example, in the case of Dostoiévski, that his speech is all-encompassing, as he is opened to the speech of others within his own, he absorbs them in a dialogical manner. He does not deny, though, that the author is the source, the axiological standing stone of the works. Therefore, Bakhtin only draws more attention to the fact that Dostoiévski speech is incredibly rich in historical terms. And this is the ideal kind of production that should be had in the novel, this dialogical mode of proceeding in literary terms. Still, he declares very openly that the novel, even if not by Dostoiévski, is the very place for different discourses

and different languages to appear, marking the historical, social, and literary contingences through the speeches.

The other thinker who discusses the question of authorship is a very relevant American writer named Wayne Booth, who wrote several well-humored pieces of criticism. He worked, also in the Sixties, with a category of conceptual analysis of the functioning of the text called *implicit author*. This category is presented in the book *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, which is a proposition to demystify the valorization of *showing versus telling*, which was a popular dichotomy used by American literary critics by the time of the publication of Booth's book. This duality relates to the differences between describing and dramatizing in narratives. Traditional criticism would declare, in the lead of Henry James and others, that showing was the most elevated kind of literature. Wayne Booth sets to prove that telling was just as effective, but it depended very much on what kind of author we were dealing with, as well as on the kind of fiction. Thus he tries to dissect the categories of kinds of narrators, characters and narrations that exist, and how these things relate to this instance of the text, which is the implicit author.

Booth argues that objectivity has been seen as an attitude of neutrality of the narration when confronted to a set of values, reporting all actions good or evil the same way. Yet, he says, it is not possible to be completely free of a value system or paradigm. Even when there is no "authorial intrusion", that is, any clear commentary from the author guiding its readers towards one or other opinion, the artwork is always going to be embedded in a certain set of values that are perceptible through its course of actions. It is then that he proposes the key concept of his argumentation: the implied author. This concept is especially useful when talking about neutrality, because it differentiates the "real" (flesh and bones) author and the narrator of the text. According to him, the implied author is an "official scribe", or a "second self", of the real author, to whom the reader has access while reading a text. All authors have their own implied author, and they differ slightly from work to work. This "figure" is responsible to elaborate a certain combination of norms that set the tone to the work – every implied author is not neutral in terms of values. Therefore, it differs from the narrator, because while the latter might be an instance of the implied author, its role is simply being the "I" of the work. Booth calls attention to three words that have been used in the place of what he calls implied author: tone, style and technique. None of them covers the broadness of his term, or conveys the idea of a number of choices made by someone rather than a self-existing thing.

Modern criticism has ignored, so far as to when Wayne Booth is writing, the fact that every choice of the author implies a certain "confinement" or molding of his readers. The myth created is that writers do their jobs only for themselves, ignoring their audience. He contrasts this opinion to the older novelists, like Trollope, who wrote in order to please his readers. His arguments are not in favor of the "tyrannical reader", but they do not favor art that does not consider its dialogical (although this is not the term he uses) constitution. In this sense, he calls attention to the fact that the greatest majority of good works of fiction rely on the good use of rhetorical devices. Even when the authors choose not to use commentary or more overt techniques, there is a "hidden rhetoric" to their works, which is translated into other elements of the narrative. The implied author is useful here again to show how, in its difference to the "real" author, almost every piece of fiction presents scenes and elements that are already known by the artist but not by the reader, and need,



therefore, to be presented in the narrative so that it can be understood. Booth does not preach for a domination of rhetoric in fiction – not all works must necessarily rely on this device, but he strives to show that it is not abominable; it is a part of literature as we know it, and it cannot be ignored nor disdained.

He concludes that fiction should use as minimal rhetoric as possible, making the reservations that the author cannot count on “universal responses” of readers unless they are given good reason to respond that way; every story must make its value system clear – with the amount of telling necessary to this – as well as making possible the reader’s subscription to these values, even if temporarily. The author’s rhetoric should make somewhat clear the kind of response it expects, even if these are permanent and universal; if there is a reversal in what would usually be considered a natural response, the author should be able to call the reader’s attention to the relationships and meanings under the surface. Finally, belief plays a big role in every artwork of fiction. It is not possible to deny in any actual experience of reading that beliefs that are represented by the author or held by the reader may hamper or enhance the effect of the text. Yet, it is not the beliefs of the actual individuals which “go around fixing leaky faucets and paying bills”, but the implied author’s and reader’s ones that are important in the act of reading. We do not mind if Dante thought this or that, but whatever beliefs he scripted in his *Inferno* are important to us as readers. The success of an artwork also depends on whether the implied reader whose place we take whenever we read any book is more or less compatible with our own worldview. We might modify our views in accordance to what the book asks us to, and that is not hampering, but there needs to be an agreement, otherwise we discard the book as bad, boring or weak.

Wayne Booth also makes a differentiating analysis on whether the narrator is dramatized in his own self or his beliefs and characteristics are shared by the author, separating: (a) the implied author (second self) which exists even with undramatized narrators, because there is an implied author’s image ‘behind the scenes’; when the novel does not refer to this author, there is no distinction between him and the undramatized narrator; (b) the undramatized narrators, whose stories are told through the consciousness of an “I” or a “he”; there is always mediation when the author puts a narrator in the tale, even if there is no personal characteristic to him; and finally, (c) the dramatized narrators, who are usually radically different from the implied author, developed as a character; they can be the third person “centers of consciousness” (although these are “disguised narrators”).

The author proposes, as an example of his thesis, to look into the technique Jane Austen skillfully engenders in *Emma*, which makes it possible to have a balance between sympathy towards the protagonist and clear moral judgment of her faults. Even though she did not have, like James, a theory for what she was doing, Jane Austen’s technique throughout *Emma*, in viewing most of the events through Emma Woodhouse’s eyes, is the perfect way of assuring that she will have the sympathy of her readers. She does not plunge so deep as to lose the comic effect of mending her faults, and the use of Knightley’s wisdom here is crucial, but she does not stay too far so we can see that her faults are, if blamable, at least deeply repented. The implied author in *Emma* is a key to the technical achievement Jane Austen is capable of grasping. Even though she is usually very close to Emma’s own views, to the point in which they are indiscernible, Austen also breaks away

from her, and this separation aids the reader into viewing the story to its full effect. She is also responsible for the managing of the norms through which we are to look into this particular work – the ideas of happiness, of correction, of perfectedness – and the marriage of Emma and Knightley is the reflection of this system being well worked on until the end. We are only able to enjoy the novel if we abide to “Austen’s” norms.

Booth’s position is similar to Bakhtin’s when he declares that the author is the holder of the moral code of the work. His idea here is that there is in every work of fiction a certain set of values that is at stake, and, whenever this set is not clear (he uses Joyce’s *Ulysses* as an example), this is a problem for the reader to solve, because we cannot find what is going on in the text. In less controversial works, this set of values is what the implicit author stands for. Making the plot and all the parts of the text work in accordance with these values is the implicit author’s function.

Having seen these different ideas on what should an author be like, it is possible to designate different names to different conceptions, the *écriture*, the function-author, the implicit author. All of them, though, more or less point to the same idea: that there is an instance of the text which guides it in some directions. There would still be other theorists to discuss about, such as Gerard Genette, whose *Narrative Discourses* brings great efforts of differentiating author and narrator. Or Umberto Eco, who, in his *Lector in Fabula*, presents the idea of the “ideal reader”. This is a figure of the perfect reader for all the inferential gaps present in the texts, and which has as a counterpart the “ideal author”, which also meets all the requirements for the text’s necessities. However, these reflections are more or less approximate to the authors analyzed so far, and are mentioned here as a reference for further research, but they do not serve as a basis for this particular work.

The final part of this text goes in the direction of proposing, based on the conceptual framework we have seen so far, a theory-based view of the literary author. It would be advisable to try a less polissemic term in order to clarify what we will try to propose here, but we find it is very difficult to dissociate it from the main idea of author. Therefore, it is going to be referred to by its primary name, the author. This figure of the literary author requires certain characterization. We have divided it in five main features, which hold the basis for the construction of the idea of an author in the molds of what literature has presented it in the last centuries.

The first characteristic is the *name on the cover*. This is related to what Michel Foucault points out about the name of the author, and everything pertaining legal and property questions of the texts. The premise of this feature is that whenever we see a name on the cover of a certain book, this is the book’s author. This takes into consideration a very materialistic part of the discussion, which encompasses all kinds of production processes, from editing house’s policies, to editors’ and revisers’ works, as well as anyone involved in the construction of the book. The name on the cover is the final stamp on a project, a material object which is sold as a commodity. Therefore, it entails certain values, in financial terms as well as in symbolic, according to the time in which it is published, the place, and the literary system of its insertion.

The second characteristic is the *body of texts*. The author is not a person in flesh, but a certain stable set of written texts. This is why we can use the expression “I have read all George Eliot”. An author has a textual body, and, thus, even though there is no human body to which we have access to (there is a separation of the writer, the actual person, and the

author), there are bodies – physical ones, material ones, with which we, as readers, have a relation.

Related to the previous characteristic, there is a second kind of body available to the readers, which is the *documented body*. It is made of the non-literary texts attributed to the author, or about his or her name, and that influence his or her image. Therefore, all kinds of biographies, interviews (written or recorded), photographs, and paintings are the documented body of texts that form the image of an author. It is not the same thing as the person, or the actual life of an individual human being, but it is a set of information which, as a whole, forms an image of a certain name. This documented body is not always accessible to the readers, but even when only partly accessible, it already poses the question that there is a part of the author which is extra-textual, that is outside, surrounding the literary work and which is going to influence the reception of the texts by their readers. Therefore, this body is not exactly a literary body; it is more of a historical body, made of contingences such as places, dates and events which are related to a human being who lives or lived but that are not his or her life. They are documented reports and records of this life that are related to a literary work.

The first two characteristics can be called internal, because they are related to the way the works are constructed in themselves. This next kind of body which is part of an author can be seen, along with the previous kind of body, as an external body. It is the *intertextual body*. This is the group of texts to which an author has access to that can be traceable within the fictional or literary texts and which situate the author, or help to delineate his or her position in a historical or social world, as well as in the literary system in which he or she is inserted. We can relate this to the idea of an author's speech being made of other discourses that are necessarily intertextual, which is at the core of both Bakhtin's and Barthes' theories of authorship (even though they hold different positions). The intertextual body is a very complex set of texts, which involves not only other fictional and literary works, but also texts in the broader sense, such as different ideologies, different scientific and philosophical kinds of thought, different social classes' discourses, and different historical references. Every reference that is inserted in an author's text is a part of his or her identity, even if they are in a different person's voice (such as a character or a first person narrator).

The final characteristic, the most clearly authorial body, is the *axiological body*, which both Booth and Bakhtin point out. It is the set of directions and values present in the literary work, which are not attributed to a character or narrator, but to the author of the work. These are the organizational values of the work, which set the division between what is good and what is evil, what is beautiful and what is ugly, who can be seen as good and who can be seen as bad, even if they cannot be seen as such through the eyes of the book's narrator. This kind of body has been overrated lately, because late criticism has not focused on whether something is good or bad, ugly or beautiful, but it is still traceable through the narratives.

This is the main point of these last two kinds of bodies presented here: they are traceable through linguistic and discursive indexes in the texts, differently from the ones that depend on various media. These two last bodies are what every work of literature holds open to its readers to search for, what and how we can access the image of the author of each work most palpably.

## REFERENCES

- BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Problemas da Poética de Dostoiévski*. Tradução de Paulo Bezerra. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Questões de Literatura e de Estética: A Teoria do Romance*. Tradução de Aurora Fornoni Bernadini, José Pereira Júnior, Augusto Góes Júnior, Helena Spryndis Nazário, Homero Freitas de Andrade. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Estética da Criação Verbal*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.
- BARTHES, Roland. “A Morte do Autor” In: *O Rumor da Língua*. Tradução de Mario Laranjeiras. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Death of the Author” In: *Image Music Text*. Tradução de Stephen Heath. S.l.: Hill and Wang, 1977.
- BELLEI, Sérgio L.P. “A Morte do Autor: um retorno à cena do crime” In: *Criação e Crítica*. São Paulo, n 12, jun. 2014. Disponível em: <http://revistas.usp.br/criacaoecritica>. Acesso em: 08/28/2014.
- BOOTH, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010. (Kindle Edition)
- CAVALHEIRO, Juciane S. “A Concepção de autor em Bakhtin, Barthes e Foucault” In: *Signum*. Londrina, n.11/2, p. 67-81, dez 2008.
- ECO, Umberto. *Lector in Fabula*. Tradução de Atílio Cancian. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2011.
- FIGUEIREDO, Eurídice. “Roland Barthes: da morte do autor ao seu retorno” In: *Criação e Crítica*. São Paulo, n 12, p 182-194, jun. 2014. Disponível em: <http://revistas.usp.br/criacaoecritica>. Acesso em: 08/28/2014.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. *A Ordem do Discurso*. Tradução de Laura Fraga de Almeida Sampaio. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “What is an author?” In: *Language, counter-memory, practice*. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- GENETTE, Gerard. *Narrative Discourse: an essay in method*. Tradução de Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- PARK, Clara C. “Author! Author! Reconstructing Roland Barthes” In: PATAI, Daphne; CORRAL, Will H. (Ed.) *Theory’s Empire: An Anthology of Dissent*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.